



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,769

12/01/2005

Sylvie Sauvaigo

1169-037

6482

35161 7590 04/03/2009

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC

1875 Eye Street, NW

Suite 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

JOIKE, MICHELE K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1636

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/539,769</p>	<p>Applicant(s) SAUVAIGO, SYLVIE</p>	
	<p>Examiner MICHELE K. JOIKE</p>	<p>Art Unit 1636</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 04 February 2009. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/NANCY VOGEL/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1636

Cont. of 11. Applicants have argued that US 2002/0022228 only teaches use of short single or double stranded oligos, which are not supercoiled, and does not teach use of plasmid DNA for the method. Paragraph 93 teaches that oligos can be made from plasmid DNA, but use of plasmid DNA is not taught or suggested by '228. Furthermore, the claimed method is superior to that described in '228 because the plasmids contain a large number of a variety of lesions, as opposed to large numbers of a single mutation type. The other references do not cure this deficiency because they do not teach use of supercoiled plasmids for quantitative assessment of excision and resynthesis DNA repair capacities. Lastly, the citation of MPEP 2144.05 to support use of supercoiled DNA is unsustainable because it is not an obvious alternative which can be taken from other references.

Applicants' arguments have not been found to be persuasive for the following reasons. '228 does contemplate use of plasmid DNA as shown in paragraph 88, "[p]roduction of DNA matrixes with specific DNA modifications by treatment of ds-oligonucleotides or linear plasmid DNA with carcinogenic factors (reactive chemical substances such as benzo(a)pyrenediolepoxide, methyl or ethyl nitrosourea, UV-light, ionizing radiation, hydrogen peroxide, methylene blue in conjunction with visible light)." You et al was used to teach that, absent evidence to the contrary, plasmid DNA is supercoiled. Since plasmid DNA is contemplated by '228, it meets that limitation in the claims. Since both physical and chemical modifications are contemplated for the plasmid DNA, a heterogenous population of mutants are made. Because '228 teaches the limitations plasmid DNA, which is supercoiled, absent evidence to the contrary, there are no deficiencies to cure. Lastly, MPEP 2144.05 was not used to suggest that supercoiled DNA is an obvious variation, but that in claims 30, 45 and 46, optimizing concentrations and temperatures is obvious.